

summaries, accurate and usable cross-references, and appropriate level of detail.

Additional detail on the scope of the review is given in the questions below. Public comments are sought on these issues to assist the NRC in its review. Although the NRC is interested in as many comments as possible, commenters are not obligated to and need not address every issue.

In providing comments, please key your responses to the number of the applicable question (e.g., "Response to A.3"). Section D should be used for additional or miscellaneous comments. Comments should be as specific as possible. The use of examples is encouraged.

Comments are requested on the following specific issues:

A. Inspection Report Content

1. Focus on safety:

a. Are inspection reports appropriately focused on safety issues? Should report writers be required to articulate the safety significance of each finding?

b. Is the level of detail for a given issue generally commensurate with the significance of that issue?

c. What threshold of significance should be used to determine whether or not an observation should be documented in the inspection report? Do existing reports generally use an appropriate threshold of significance?

d. Are reports, as currently written, too negative in their focus? Should "equal time" be given to discussions of licensee strengths and successes? If so, what criteria should be used to include such findings in inspection reports?

2. Supporting Details:

a. Do inspection reports generally contain an appropriate level of detail to describe technically complex issues?

b. What level of detail should be included for describing an event when that event has already been described separately in a licensee event report?

c. What level of detail should be used to describe inspection activities when little or no findings have resulted from those activities?

d. What are the costs and benefits of including, as enclosures to the report, all referenced material to support report findings (e.g., licensee procedures, supporting calculations, or independent studies)?

3. Enforcement Issues:

a. What information should be included in inspection reports to support taking enforcement actions?

b. Are reports generally clear in stating the circumstances of the violation (e.g., what requirement was

violated, how it was violated, who identified it, etc.)?

c. Is sufficient detail generally given to substantiate enforcement-related conclusions?

d. Should all minor and non-cited violations be documented in inspection reports? What threshold should be used to determine the significance of compliance items that must be documented?

4. Clear Conclusions:

a. Are report conclusions generally well-supported by facts? Is the progression of logic generally clear?

b. Is a conclusion statement always necessary for each section of the report (e.g., when limited observations or findings were made in a given area)?

B. Inspection Report Format

1. Consistency:

a. Should inspection report formats be consistent from region to region? What benefits or problems would result from adopting a standardized report outline?

b. What are the advantages and disadvantages of combined or integrated inspection reports (e.g., one report per six weeks, per reactor site, covering all areas)?

c. When is the use of "boilerplate" appropriate (i.e., standard phrases or sentences used from report to report to describe similar inspection methods, purposes, or conclusions)? Should more or less boilerplate be used?

2. Readability:

a. What features increase or decrease a report's readability or effectiveness in communication?

b. Do you prefer a narrative or a "bulletized" appearance?

3. Usefulness:

a. What features increase or decrease the efficiency of later efforts to retrieve information from a report (e.g., for SALP reviews, regional studies, or external reviews)?

b. Are there particular parts of the report that could be deleted without decreasing the report quality or detracting from its function?

4. Report Summaries: What information should be included in a report summary? How should it be presented?

5. Cover Letters: How might cover letters be modified to express more clearly the level of concern, or to better convey a particular performance message to a licensee?

C. Inspection Report Style

1. Style variations: In what ways do variations in writing style influence the effectiveness of inspection reports?

2. NRC style: Are there particular features of standard NRC style (e.g.,

consistent use of past tense or third-person form) that make inspection reports more readable? Less readable?

3. Tone: Are inspection reports generally written in an appropriate tone?

4. Grammatical Construction: Are inspection reports generally acceptable in sentence and paragraph construction? Do they give evidence of careful proofreading?

D. Additional Comments

In addition to the above specific issues, commenters are invited to provide any other views on NRC inspection reports that could assist the NRC in improving their effectiveness.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard W. Borchardt,

Chief, Inspection Program Branch, Directorate for Inspection & Support Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-13104 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 75th meeting on June 21 and 22, 1995, in Room T-2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of portions that may be closed to discuss information the release of which would represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, June 21, 1995-8:30 a.m.

until 6 p.m. and

Thursday, June 22, 1995-8:30 a.m. until 4 p.m.

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Final PRA Policy Statement*—The Committee will discuss the NRC staff's proposed Probabilistic Risk Assessment Policy Statement and Implementation Plan with representatives of the NRC staff.

B. *Technical Site Suitability Process*—Representatives from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) will discuss the major elements of the technical site suitability process being applied at the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

C. *Seismic Hazard Analyses*—The Committee will review the NRC staff and Center for Nuclear Waste

Regulatory Analyses' strategy for evaluating the DOE's seismic hazard analyses program. This review will include discussions of the use of the SEISMO-1 code, related key technical uncertainties, and the status of topical reports under review.

D. Meeting with the Director, NRC's Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards—The Director will provide information to the Committee on the status of current waste management issues, which will include the progress on the integration of key technical uncertainties, the status of DOE technical basis report reviews, and the results of alcove tests at the proposed Yucca Mountain high-level waste repository.

E. Preparation of ACNW Reports—The Committee will discuss proposed reports including regulatory issues on low-level-radioactive waste performance assessment, and Seismic Hazard Analyses for the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. Additional topics will be considered as time permits.

F. Use of Expert Judgment—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with the NRC staff on draft technical guidance on the use of expert judgment in performance assessment for licensing a radioactive waste repository.

G. Recent Report by the National Academy of Sciences—The Committee will hold discussions with members of the Academy and their staff on a recent Academy report on the Ward Valley, California low-level-waste disposal site.

H. Committee Activities/Future Agenda—The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will also discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members. The Committee will elect officers for the next twelve months.

I. Miscellaneous—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 7, 1994 (59 FR 51219). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and

questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACNW Executive Director, Dr. John T. Larkins, as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the ACNW Executive Director prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with the ACNW Executive Director if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the ACNW Executive Director, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone 301/415-7360), between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. EDT.

Dated: May 23, 1995.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-13105 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Board Meeting: Waste Isolation Strategy, Thermal Management Strategy, the Engineered Barrier System

Pursuant to its authority under section 5051 of Public Law 100-203, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board will hold its summer meeting on July 11-12, 1995, in Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting will be held at the Little America Hotel, 500 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101; (Tel) 801-363-6781; (Fax) 801-596-5911. The meeting is open to the public and will begin at 8:30 a.m. both days. Presentations during the meeting will focus on the Department of Energy's (DOE) advanced conceptual design for a potential deep geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and defense high-level radioactive waste at

Yucca Mountain, Nevada; new radionuclide release standards for Yucca Mountain (based on the National Academy of Sciences studies); and updates on environmental impact statement scoping studies for the DOE's high-level nuclear waste program and exploratory facility construction at Yucca Mountain (including tunnel boring machine operations). The Board also will hear about the annotated outline being developed by the DOE for license application to construct a repository, should the Yucca Mountain site be found suitable.

Time will be set aside on the agenda for comments and questions from the public. To ensure that everyone wishing to speak is provided time to do so, the Board encourages those who have comments to sign the Public Comment Register, which will be located at the sign-in table. Those signing up are advised that, depending on the number of people wishing to speak, a speaking limit may have to be set on the length of individual remarks. However, written comments of any length may be submitted for the record.

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was created by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of activities undertaken by the DOE in its program to manage the disposal of the nation's spent nuclear fuel and defense high-level waste. In that same legislation, Congress directed the DOE to characterize a site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for its suitability as a potential location for a permanent repository for the disposal of that waste.

Transcripts of the meeting will be available on computer disk or on a library-loan basis in paper format from Davonya Barnes, Board staff, beginning September 6, 1995. For further information, contact Frank Randall, External Affairs, 1100 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 910, Arlington, Virginia 22209; (Tel) 703-235-4473; (Fax) 703-235-4495.

Dated: May 24, 1995.

William Barnard,

Executive Director, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

[FR Doc. 95-13127 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-AM-M

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Notice of Request for Reclearance of OPM Form 2809

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.